

1859 bearing the notation, "A weed in garden and seen there for many years past." The specimen had been given various identifications, all obviously wrong. Taking it to the Gray Herbarium I narrowed it down to *Rorippa* and with the aid of Dr. Reed Rollins finally matched it with *R. sessiliflora* (Nutt.) Hitch., a plant of the South and West. While made nearly a century ago this still appears to be the only New England collection of the species.—STUART K. HARRIS,
DEPT. OF BIOLOGY, BOSTON UNIVERSITY.

A NEW COLOR FORM OF *SOLIDAGO SEMPERVIRENS*.—***Solidago sempervirens*** L., forma ***citrea*** Harris, forma nov. Ad formam typicam similis, sed floribus pallide citrinis. Like the typical form but the florets pale lemon yellow.

Any botanist finding this conspicuous color form growing with normal plants near the parking lot of the Crane Beach Reservation in Ipswich, Essex County, Massachusetts, where it is now abundant, would have no reason to suspect that it was not native to the area. However, this is not the case, the original source was in a different county.

A single plant of the color form was noticed in a colony of normal plants growing on open ground in Winthrop, Suffolk County, Massachusetts by Mr. Francis Wade in 1942. He dug the plant and moved it to his garden in Stoneham, Middlesex County, where it prospered and Mr. Wade divided it annually. When he moved to Ipswich, he took the clones with him and continued to divide them until he now has a considerable number. Seedlings coming up resembled the parent plant. Mr. Wade then gathered seed in his garden and scattered it on various areas about Ipswich where the typical form was growing. In a number of these areas the new form seems to be well established and its pale yellow heads contrast sharply with the deep yellow heads of the normal plants. More recently Mr. Wade has scattered seeds of the color form along the sides of the highway between Newburyport and Plum Island but to date none of these plants have flowered.

Mr. Wade brought me material of the new form in September of 1954 and I showed it to Dr. Reed Rollins of the Gray Herbarium. Suspecting that the plants might be polyploids because

of the head size and thickness of the leaves, he had Miss Ann Morrill make a cytological study of the material. The pollen proved to be normal and the chromosome number was normal for the species.

Material Studied: Massachusetts, Essex County: from clone of original plant, garden of Francis Wade, Ipswich, *S. K. Harris*, 13982 4 October 1957 (TYPE in GH; isotype in NEBC); garden, Ipswich, Francis Wade 20 September 1954 (NEBC); near parking lot of Crane Beach Reservation, Ipswich, *S. K. Harris* 13872, 27 September 1957 (NEBC). STUART K. HARRIS, BOSTON UNIVERSITY.

EVOLUTION OF FLOWERING PLANTS.—According to legend, the Ostrich, when frightened, buries its head in the sand, apparently reasoning that what cannot be seen or heard has no reality. In human affairs this is the sort of attitude that continually harks back to the "good old days," forgetting the open sewers, the tainted meat, and the little children choking with Diphtheria. Needless to say, there should be no tolerance, in Science, of Ostrich reasoning. In Biology, the increase of factual knowledge, in both the observational and experimental fields, of late years, has been truly remarkable. In many cases, however, theoretical considerations have not kept pace with the increase in factual data, with the unfortunate result that some biologists persist in trying to square the modern corpus of knowledge with theories that were none too happily contrived fifty or one hundred years ago. Indeed, perhaps the most serious deficiency in contemporary biology is the absence of a sober, impartial, encyclopedic, evaluation and correlation of the facts available in the fields of genetics, ecology, comparative morphology, and taxonomy.

A short time ago there was published a book entitled "Features of Evolution in the Flowering Plants."¹ The author is Ronald Good, a well known phytogeographer, and Professor of Botany at the University of Hull (England). On first glance, the book makes an extremely good impression, for it is simply and clearly written, and replete with examples and tastefully produced illustrations. A second look, however, shows that the book is fifty years out of date. The author has chosen to ignore most of the modern data of taxonomy, comparative morphology, and genetics. In doing so, he has not only denied himself the answers to many of his questions (or at least what answers may be available), but he has also denied himself the data necessary to frame his questions meaningfully.

As a plant geographer, the author seems to have picked up a nodding acquaintance with a great variety of species of flowering plants—and with a number of currently unpopular hypotheses about the mechanism of evolution. Unfortunately, it frequently appears that he does not have

¹ Longmans, Green & Co., London and New York, 1956, 30 shillings.